

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
7	09/851,868	05/09/2001	Stanley W. Stephenson	82633RLO	4959
Ψ	7590 12/17/2003			EXAMI	NER
J	Thomas H. Close			LIU, MING HUN	
	Patent Legal Staff Eastman kodak Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201			2675	
				DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003	9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/851,868	STEPHENSON ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ming-Hun Liu	2675				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 11/20/2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
<u>PERIOD FOR RE</u>	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	•					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by tl	ne Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s) PTO-1449 Paper No(s).					
10. Other:	The					
STEVEN SARAS						
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600						
LECHINOLOGY CENTER 2000						





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amended claim 1 alters the scope of the claim wherein a new search maybe required to determine the patentablity of the claimed invention.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the proposed amendment, by removing "selecting one of the first and second fixed voltages" the claim appears to bringt forth a new 35 USC § 112second paragraph issue where "the selected fixed voltage" has insufficient antecedent basis.

In response to the arguments, the claim even after the amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance. In response to the argument that Morich fails to include a "switching means" is incorrect. Morich teaches a controller that chooses the necessary voltage functions, a controller that acts as the switching means (column 2,lines 23-25). In reference to the argument that Morich's invention lacks a voltage divider, refer to column 13, lines 13-16 where Morich uses a capacitive voltage divider. The claim never limited the division method to a resistive division.